

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This filing is in response to the Final Office Action mailed September 4, 2007 (“Office Action”). Claims 39 and 41 have been amended to clarify the novel features of the various embodiments of the present inventions. ***No new matter has been added.***

### **A. Overview of the Embodiments of the Invention**

As described in the Applicants’ specification in the Background of the Invention section, there are fast cookies and slow cookies. Some ***slow cookies***, such as those that are cryptographically generated, may take a relatively significant amount of time for the server to generate and transmit to the client in a server response message. If the transmission of content (e.g., html content, graphics, etc.) is delayed pending receipt of such slow cookies by the client, this can considerably slow down the rendering of content at the client.

An embodiment of the present invention addresses this problem by permitting delayed or asynchronous delivery of slow cookies so that initial web page generation and display can take place at the client while still awaiting the slow cookies. An embodiment of the present invention provides for this by having the server check client “clear gif” requests (request including a clear gif link) to see whether they include the slow cookie, thus confirming receipt of the slow cookie by the client. If the server determines the client’s clear gif request reflects receipt of the slow cookie, the server simply responds with a clear gif response with no slow cookie. If the server determines the client’s clear gif request does not reflect receipt of the slow cookie, the server will attempt to retrieve and deliver the slow cookie to the client in a server clear gif response that includes the slow cookie that the client needs.

**B. The Claim 39 Complies with 35 U. S. C. § 112, second paragraph**

At page 4 of the Office Action, it is asserted that claim 39 is “incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements.” MPEP 2172.01 indicates that a claim which fails to interrelate essential elements of the invention may be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are not omitting an essential element. The Office Action alleges that there is no element detailing the relationship between “a link indicating receipt of a slow cookie and determining if the client has previously received the slow cookie.” Office Action at 4. Further, the Office Action alleges that “A can be broadly read as a connection request indicating the receipt of a cookie within said connection request. If this is the reading applied, then B is referencing a previously stored slow cookie prior to A’s connection request, which would involve the transmission of a slow cookie A even though the client has already received slow cookie B.” Office Action at 5.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Step (a) indicates that the server receives a connection request including a clear gif link, the request (1) including an indicia evidencing client receipt of the slow cookie or (2) not including an indicia evidencing client receipt of the slow cookie.

Step (b) determines *if the slow cookie has been received* by the client;

Step (c) responds with a clear gif response without the slow cookie if the slow cookie is determined to have been previously received by the client;

Step (d) responds with a clear gif response with the slow cookie if the slow cookie is determined not to have been previously received by the client.

In response to the Office Action's argument, if step (a) is read as a connection request indicating receipt of a cookie, at step (b) the server determines that the slow cookie has been received, then at step (c) if the slow cookie is determined to have been previously received (as is the case in this exemplary scenario), the server responds with a clear gift response without the slow cookie. Accordingly, the claim is not omitting an essential step. Furthermore, the claim, as written, clearly defines the novel embodiments of the inventions.

Contrary to the Office Action's statement, step (b) is not referencing a previously stored cookie to prior to step (a)'s connection request - rather, step (b) determines if the slow cookie has been received by the client pursuant to a prior request from the client.

Should the Examiner disagree, Applicants respectfully request clarification as to what essential element is missing from claim 39.

**C. The Claims are Not Anticipated by McDonough, U.S. Patent No. 5,991,878**

Claims 39-42 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,991,878 to McDonough ("McDonough").

McDonough appears to be directed to controlling access to information in a distributed computing system. A request for information is received and is accompanied by encrypted session state data. Based on the encrypted session state data, it is determined whether to pass the request on to a source of the information. *See Abstract.*

The Office Action indicates that the terms "slow cookie" and "fast cookie" have been broadly interpreted as an authentication verification and a cookie with user data. The amended claims clarify and the specification supports that "the fast cookie is immediately available *for transmission to the client*" and the "slow cookie is not immediately available *for transmission to*

*the client.” See, e.g., [0025], [0026]* of this Application. Also, as discussed in the Abstract, a slow cookie may include, for example, a cryptographically generated cookie that might be used for a single-session sign-on. Therefore, contrary to the Office Action’s allegations, Applicant has clearly stated the difference between a “fast cookie” and a “slow cookie” in the specification and further included this limitation in the claims itself. Accordingly, the Office Action must consider the differences and cannot ignore positively recited claim terms. It is respectfully submitted that McDonough fails to disclose each and every limitation of the claims.

The claims of this Application are directed to the important and novel method and system for enabling a computer system to operate more efficiently by enabling a client to access a website via so-called fast cookies and, thereafter, permitting other (“slow”) cookies, such as GET ACCESS cookies, to be delivered asynchronously as they become available. *See, e.g., [0007]* of this Application. McDonough is not directed to this problem, so it is not surprising that McDonough does not remotely disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention.

Moreover, the independent claims clarify “wherein the clear gif link comprises a link to a transparent image file.” Accordingly, the Office Action’s reliance on McDonough’s URL request cannot meet this claim limitation. Therefore, the rejection under McDonough is improper and should be withdrawn.

McDonough also fails to teach or suggest the conditional limitations in the claimed invention wherein (1) the server responds to the client request with a clear gif response without a slow cookie if the client request indicated the cookie was already received, and (2) the server responds to the client request with a clear gif response and a slow cookie if the client request indicated the cookie had not yet been received. These features are not remotely suggested by McDonough.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Patent Office bears the burden of presenting at least a *prima facie* case of anticipation. Anticipation requires that a prior art reference disclose, either expressly or under the principles of inherency, each and every element of the claimed inventions. In addition, the prior art reference must sufficiently describe the claimed inventions so as to have placed the public in possession of it. In this case, as discussed in detail above, the Office Action has failed to show that the reference discloses each and every claim limitation recited by Applicants.

Accordingly, since McDonough fails to teach substantive features of the claims, it cannot anticipate them under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Further, Applicant submits that the claims are non-obvious over McDonough because that reference does not suggest the claimed invention, nor is there any objective motivation for radically modifying McDonough to arrive at the claimed inventions.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that prosecution and allowance of the application will be expedited through an interview, whether personal or telephonic, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with any suggestions leading to the favorable disposition of the application.

It is believed that no fees are due for filing this Response. However, the Director is hereby authorized to treat any current or future reply, requiring a petition for an extension of time for its timely submission as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time. Applicants also authorize the Director to charge all required fees, fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.17, or all required extension of time fees, to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

By:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Yisun Song  
Registration No 44,487

Dated: January 4, 2008

Hunton & Williams LLP  
Intellectual Property Department  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20006-1109  
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)  
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)